



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/809,766	03/15/2001	Juan Ferrera	FIS920000237US1	4985

30743 7590 04/23/2003

WHITHAM, CURTIS & CHRISTOFFERSON, P.C.  
11491 SUNSET HILLS ROAD  
SUITE 340  
RESTON, VA 20190

EXAMINER

GURZO, PAUL M

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2881

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n No.

09/809,766

Applicant(s)

FERRERA ET AL.

Examiner

Paul Gurzo

Art Unit

2881

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 February 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 19 February 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_ 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 6-8, and 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizaki (5,932,884), and further in view of Utsumi (5,831,272).

Regarding claims 1 and 20, 884 teaches a charged particle beam lithography tool and a method of operating such a tool including a source of a beam (51), a means for causing a shadow pattern with the charged particle beam (50), a means for shaping the beam (54a and 54b), a means for deflecting the beam to a desired location (55), and a means for generating a correction (col. 1, lines 7-14, col. 3, line 43 - col. 4, line 9, col. 5, lines 8-32, and Fig. 2). 884 teaches deflected scanning of the beam on the mask (53), it is known in the art of beam lithography that such a scanning is known as dithering, but it is not explicitly stated. In addition, 272 teaches that an electron beam is deflected in relation to a mask by a raster scan (col. 3, lines 38-40). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to raster scan because it will lead to an efficient pattern transfer as is desired by both the applied prior art.

Regarding claims 2-4 and 19, 884 teaches a first and second shaping apertures (54a and 54b) that will deflect and pass in the desired manner and Fig. 2 clearly depicts the claimed order of operation.

Art Unit: 2881

Regarding claim 6, it is well known in the art that dithering is performed by moving a pattern in a repeated pattern having a repetition time.

Regarding claim 7, it is well known in the art that the repetition time is similar to the spot exposure time.

Regarding claim 8, 272 teaches raster scanning as applied above.

Claims 5, 11-13, and 16-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizaki (5,932,884), in view of Utsumi (5,831,272), and further in view of Goodberlet et al. ("Extending Spatial-Phase-Locked Electron-Based Lithography to two Dimensions", Applied Physics, December 1997, pages 7557-7559).

Regarding claim 5, the above applied prior art does not teach the use of fiducial marks of a scintillating material to detect this output of light. However, Goodberlet et al. teach the use of a fiducial grid as well as fabricating this grid from scintillating material. They also teach the claimed optical detection (page 7559, Section 4, paragraph 1). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to include fiducial marks of a scintillating material because a scintillator can yield near infinite values of contrast.

Regarding claim 11, it is well known in the art that dithering is performed by moving a pattern in a repeated pattern having a repetition time.

Regarding claim 12, it is well known in the art that the repetition time is similar to the spot exposure time.

Regarding claim 13, 272 teaches raster scanning as applied above.

Regarding claim 16, 884 teaches a charged particle beam lithography tool and a method of operating such a tool including a source of a beam (51), a means for causing a shadow pattern

Art Unit: 2881

with the charged particle beam (50), a means for shaping the beam (54a and 54b), a means for deflecting the beam to a desired location (55), and a means for generating a correction (col. 1, lines 7-14, col. 3, line 43 - col. 4, line 9, col. 5, lines 8-32, and Fig. 2). 884 teaches deflected scanning of the beam on the mask (53). It is well known in the art to use fiducial marks as Goodberlet et al. teach in their design. Further, it is known that fiducial marks are used on the target and it is inherent to the design of prior art that their detection will detect the claimed shadow pattern that is incident on the fiducial marks.

Regarding claim 17, Goodberlet et al. teach the use of scintillating material as applied above.

Regarding claim 18, it is an obvious matter of design choice to align the fiducial marks on the target so that they correspond to the shadow pattern because that will ensure that the beam is properly detected and it will be easier to generate a correction means when the most accurate beam placement is known.

Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizaki (5,932,884), in view of Utsumi (5,831,272), and further in view of Sakamoto et al. (5,051,556).

The above-applied prior art does not teach an angled shape that is retraced with an offset. However, Sakamoto et al. teach that the beam is offset from the optical axis, and the path can be adjusted by decomposing the offset of the electron beam into an angular offset component  $\phi$  representing a deviation of the beam direction from vertical and further into a lateral offset component  $\delta$  representing a lateral deviation of the beam from the properly aligned beam path, and further by changing these offset components  $\phi$  and  $\delta$  independently (col. 11, lines 29-46).

Claims 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Aizaki (5,932,884), in view of Utsumi (5,831,272), in view of Goodberlet et al. ("Extending Spatial-Phase-Locked Electron-Based Lithography to two Dimensions", Applied Physics, December 1997, pages 7557-7559), and further in view of Sakamoto et al. (5,051,556).

The above-applied prior art does not teach an angled shape that is retraced with an offset. However, Sakamoto et al. teach that the beam is offset from the optical axis, and the path can be adjusted by decomposing the offset of the electron beam into an angular offset component  $\phi$  representing a deviation of the beam direction from vertical and further into a lateral offset component  $\delta$  representing a lateral deviation of the beam from the properly aligned beam path, and further by changing these offset components  $\phi$  and  $\phi$  independently (col. 11, lines 29-46).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Paul Gurzo whose telephone number is (703) 306-0532. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thurs. 7:30 - 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Lee can be reached on (703) 308-4116. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

Application/Control Number: 09/809,766

Page 6

Art Unit: 2881

PMG

April 21, 2003



JOHN R. LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2800